

Board of County Commissioners
Inter-Office Memorandum



DATE: September 15, 1999

TO: Gary Johnson, Director of Community Development
Lee Hartsfield, Director of Growth Management Support Services

FROM: The members of the Tree and Wildlife Preservation Committee

SUBJECT: Withdrawal Requests for the Wildlife Preservation Fund

Three applications for monies from the Wildlife Preservation Fund were submitted on August 1, 1999. Withdrawal requests were received from St. Francis Wildlife Association, Goose Creek Wildlife Sanctuary, and Florida Wild Mammal Association. Review of the applications was conducted by members of the Tree and Wildlife Preservation Committee on August 31, 1999. The members of the Tree and Wildlife Preservation Committee include Tom Jackson, Canopy Road Coordinator Leon County Public Works, Stan Rosenthal, County Forester, Cooperative Extension Service; William Sheffal, Natural Resources Extension Agent, Cooperative Extension Service; Sine Murray Environmental Review Specialist Leon County Growth and Environmental Management; Sandra Roper, Environmental Review Specialist, Leon County Department of Growth and Environmental Management.

The receipt of wounded and injured wildlife from Leon County was documented by each organization. Expenditures for the care and treatment of these injured animals were also detailed. Applicants are requesting reimbursement for these expenditures.

It was the committees decision that all qualified organizations (*organizations who provide proof of appropriate wildlife rehabilitation permits and receipt of animals from Leon County*) receive a minimum amount for reimbursement towards operating expenses based on the number of animals from Leon County that were served during one year. The number of animals served by each organization was tallied. Organizations were then categorized as follows: small (*served 0-100 animals*), medium (*served 101-500 animals*), large (*served 501+ animals*). Five percent (5%) of the total amount available for disbursement is to be divided between qualified organizations categorized as small. The remaining 95% of the total amount available for disbursement is to be divided between qualified organizations categorized as medium or large based on a one to two ratio.

Memo: Wildlife Preservation Fund
September 15, 1999
Page 2

For example:

Amount in fund : \$4121

Number of qualified organizations categorized as small: 1

$$4121 \times .05(5\%) = \$206.05$$

Additional amount to be divided between qualified organizations categorized as medium or large =
 $4121 - 206.05 = \$3914.95$

Number of qualified organizations categorized as medium or large: 2 (1 medium, 1 large)

total number of shares = 3 (*Each medium receives one share 1x1= and each large receives 2 shares 2x1=2*)

$3914.95/3 = \$1304.98$ per share (the medium organization would receive \$1304.98 and the large organization would receive \$2609.97)

Based on this formula we would recommend that monies from the Wildlife Preservation Fund be disbursed as follows:

Amount in Wildlife Preservation Fund
available for disbursement: \$4,121

Name	# of animals served from Leon County	Amount of reimbursement (rounded to the nearest dollar)
St. Francis Wildlife Association	1623(large)	\$2610 (\$1304.98x2)
Goose Creek Wildlife Sanctuary	215(medium)	\$1305 (\$1304.98x1)
Florida Wild Mammal Association	16 (small)	\$206 (\$4121x.05{5%})
Total	1854	\$4,121

It was the consensus of the Tree and Wildlife Preservation Committee reviewing FY1999 Wildlife Preservation Fund withdrawal applications that the following philosophy guide our allocation decisions this year:

Memo: Wildlife Preservation Fund
September 15, 1999
Page 3

The concern of Wildlife rescue and rehabilitation (WR&R) organizations (and a growing number of ordinary citizens) for the plight of wildlife and individual wild animals in our urbanizing landscape translates not only into donations and volunteer action, but also into demand that local government provide support for animal rescue and rehabilitation services.

There are several reasons for wanting to support as many WR&R operations as arise in the community to meet a perceived need and survive to demonstrate organizational and financial viability. One reason is that a diversity of geographic locations makes the entire network more convenient to citizen volunteers and to clients -- especially since WR&R organizations often refer clients to each other based on proximity. Another is that a diversity of philosophies, personalities, animal-group specialties and ancillary activities (such as hands-on wildlife education for school children) provides a greater chance that each citizen of Leon County desiring to volunteer with one of these organizations will find his or her niche. Finally, from the perspective of emergency preparedness, there is much to be said for developing and sustaining the physical and personnel infrastructure of a local WR&R network so that the community has a mechanism for dealing with wildlife disasters that occur from time-to-time. For example, natural disasters, such as hurricanes can wreak widespread destruction upon wildlife food and shelter resources while disorienting and injuring scores of animals (as was the case with Hurricane Andrew). Thus, we look at the encouragement of all viable WR&R organizations as an opportunity to help promote growth of the WR&R infrastructure serving Leon County's citizens and injured/orphaned animals. As the WR&R infrastructure grows, so does the number of citizens involved in educating themselves and others about the relationship between urbanization and impacts to wildlife. Eventually, there may be enough of them to demand that urban development be planned, designed and permitted based on a standard of lesser impact to wildlife, at which time the expenditure of monies from this Fund will approach the intended mitigation for wildlife habitat destruction that triggered their collection.

Furthermore, there is opportunity to leverage the fiscal impact we can have, if we allocate our monies wisely. Allocating a small amount of money that is large when compared to an organization's total budget, we can assist small, fledgling operations to a more significant degree than by giving the same amount to larger, better-established ones -- making small operations good investments since our goal is to build maximum citizen awareness of the needs of urban wildlife through a diverse network of WR&R providers. This opportunity becomes more acutely evident when the total amount of money to be disbursed is small -- as is the case in 1999 with only \$4,121 available for disbursement among three qualifying organizations applying for public support from the County's Wildlife Preservation Fund. But, while giving smaller operations a boost, it is also our intent to recognize and reward the larger operations that to date have been shouldering a higher percentage of the total WR&R caseload in Leon County. We feel that by allocating an equal public subsidy to both large and small operations, we accomplish our objective in both instances -- when the caseload is primarily from Leon County. Qualifying operations which mainly serve surrounding counties but frequently receive cases from Leon County should also be encouraged and recognized for their contribution to handling our WR&R caseload, with a lesser subsidy.

Memo: Wildlife Preservation Fund
September 15, 1999
Page 4

We hope that by writing down this philosophy underlying the 1999 Committee's allocation decisions, that the deliberations of future allocation committees will be facilitated. We recognize the changing condition of wildlife in Leon County to be primarily a response to changing land uses for a growing human population, and hope that WR&R organizations will evolve into more innovative operations that proactively address the future welfare of wildlife in Leon County.